

itself, Y2K computer problems will be causing computer system malfunctions and failures for years into the next decade. Y2K is much more about the dates that can span the century boundary represented in *data* that must be processed by *software* than it is about any calendar time or clock issues. Because of the vast amounts of these, the complex intertwining among them and our less than complete understanding of the whole, it will take years for the infrastructure to "calm down" after Y2K impacts themselves AND the impacts of the sometimes frantic and misguided changes we have made to it. The current prevention phase is only the beginning.

4.2 Rapid and Effective Organizational Adaptability Will Be a Prime Necessity. They key to an organization's ability to continue to provide the goods and services other organizations and individuals need to continue their operations will be determined by an organization's ability to adapt its practices and policies quickly and effectively in the face of potentially numerous, rapid and unexpected events.

4.3 Lawsuits, Actual or Threatened, Will Divert Requisite Resources. Preventing and minimizing harm to society from Y2K disruption is different than, and at times opposed to, protecting one's organization from legal liability. Addressing lawsuits, and even the threat of a lawsuit, will divert requisite resources, particularly management attention, from an organization's rapid and effective adaptation. This is already happening regarding technical prevention and will get worse the longer such legal threats remain. Organizational management has much more experience dealing with legal threats than they do addressing something as unique and unprecedented as Y2K. Their tendency is to address the familiar at the expense of the novel. They must be allowed to focus on the greater good.

4.4 Judicial System Overload Is Another Danger. Given the great interactive and interdependent complexity of Y2K's impact on the operations of our institutions on a national and global scale, the effort to determine exactly what happened, why it happened and who is legally responsible for each micro-event is itself a huge undertaking requiring the resolution of many questions. For the legal and judicial system to attempt to resolve the legal rights and remedies of affected parties while Y2K impacts are still unfolding will, in any case, threaten to overwhelm the legal and judicial system's capacity to assure justice in the matter, let alone its ability to continue to do its other necessary work.

For all of the reasons discussed above, we support limitations on Y2K-related legal liability. Minimizing harm and assessing blame are each formidable and important tasks, but they cannot be done simultaneously without sacrificing one for the other. Minimizing harm is more important and there is an increased threat to our welfare if assessing blame adversely interferes with our ability to minimize harm. The value of incentives at this late date is very small. We trust that the collective wisdom of Congress will find ways to reduce these threats. We have additional background material available. Please contact IEEE staff contact Paula Dunne if you are interested in this material. We have other ideas beyond the scope of this legislation of what the U.S. federal government can do to help minimize

harm throughout this crisis. We are ready to help in any way you may deem appropriate. Respectfully,

THE INSTITUTE OF ELECTRICAL AND  
ELECTRONICS ENGINEERS (IEEE),  
TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES BOARD, YEAR 2000  
TECHNICAL INFORMATION FOCUS GROUP.

Mr. President, the bill we passed earlier this week is modest. It may very well not meet all the concerns expressed by the IEEE. The legislation may, however, at least reduce these threats. As a consequence, we must enact meaningful legislation and we must enact it quickly.

#### USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 105, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) authorizing the law enforcement torch run for the 1999 Special Olympics World Games to be run through the Capitol Grounds.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) was agreed to.

#### NATIONAL FATHER'S RETURN DAY

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 125, submitted earlier today by Senators LIEBERMAN, GREGG, and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 125) encouraging and promoting greater involvement of fathers in their children's lives and designating June 20, 1999, as "National Father's Return Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 125) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 125

Whereas more than 1 out of every 3 children currently live in a household where the child's father does not reside;

Whereas approximately half of all the children born in the United States will spend at least half of their childhood in a family without a father figure;

Whereas approximately 40 to 50 percent of all marriages are predicted to end in divorce;

Whereas approximately 3 out of every 5 divorcing couples have at least 1 child;

Whereas almost half of all children aged 11 through 16 that live in mother-headed homes have not seen their father in the last 12 months;

Whereas 79 percent of people in the United States believe that the most significant family or social problem facing the country is the physical absence of fathers from the home, resulting in a lack of involvement of fathers in the rearing and development of children;

Whereas the likelihood that a young male will engage in criminal activity doubles if he is reared without a father and triples if he lives in a neighborhood comprised largely of single-parent families;

Whereas studies reveal that even in high-crime, inner city neighborhoods, over 90 percent of children from safe, stable, 2-parent homes do not become delinquents;

Whereas compared to children reared in 2-parent families, children reared in single-parent families are less likely to complete high school and thus, more likely as adults to obtain low paying, unstable jobs;

Whereas researchers have linked the presence of fathers with improved fetal and infant development, and father-child interaction has been shown to promote a child's physical well-being, perceptual abilities, and competency for interpersonal relations;

Whereas researchers have also found that both boys and girls demonstrate a greater ability to take initiative and exercise self-control when they are reared by fathers who are actively involved in their upbringing;

Whereas the general involvement of parents in the lives of their children has decreased significantly over the last generation;

Whereas a Gallup Poll indicated that over 50 percent of all adults agree that fathers today spend less time with their children than their fathers spent with them;

Whereas nearly 20 percent of children in grades 6 through 12 report that they have not had a meaningful conversation with even 1 parent in over a month;

Whereas in a broad survey of 100,000 children in grades 6 through 12, less than half of the children "feel they have family boundaries or high expectations from parents or teachers";

Whereas 3 out of 4 adolescents report that "they do not have adults in their lives that model positive behaviors";

Whereas in a widely cited study of the health risks to the young people in the United States, University of Minnesota researchers found that "independent of race, ethnicity, family structure and poverty status, adolescents who are connected to their parents, their schools, and to their school community are healthier than those who are not", and that "when teens feel connected to their families, and when parents are involved in their children's lives, teens are protected";

Whereas millions of single mothers in the United States are heroically struggling to raise their children in safe and loving environments;

Whereas promoting responsible fatherhood is not meant to diminish the parenting efforts of single mothers, but rather to increase the chances that children will have 2 caring parents to help them grow up healthy and secure;

Whereas many of this country's leading experts on family and child development agree that it is in the best interest of both children and the United States to encourage more 2-parent, father-involved families to form and endure;

Whereas in 1994, the National Fatherhood Initiative was formed to further the goal of raising societal awareness about the ramifications of father absence and father disengagement by mobilizing a national response to father absence;

Whereas the Congressional Task Force on Fatherhood Promotion and the Senate Task Force on Fatherhood Promotion that were formed in 1997, the Governors' Task Force on Fatherhood Promotion of 1998, and the Mayor's Task Force on Fatherhood Promotion of 1999 were created to work in partnership with the National Fatherhood Initiative;

Whereas on June 14, 1999, the National Fatherhood Initiative is holding a national summit on supporting urban fathers in Washington, D.C., to mobilize a response to father absence by many powerful sectors of society, including public policy, social services, educational, religious, entertainment, media, and civic groups; and

Whereas those groups are working across party, ideological, racial, and gender lines in order to reverse the trend of father absence and disengagement by encouraging and supporting responsible fatherhood and greater father involvement in children's lives: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that the creation of a better United States requires the active involvement of fathers in the rearing and development of their children;

(2) urges each father in the United States to accept his full share of responsibility for the lives of his children, to be actively involved in rearing his children, and to encourage the emotional, academic, moral, and spiritual development of his children;

(3) urges the States to hold fathers who ignore their legal responsibilities accountable for their actions and to pursue more aggressive enforcement of child support obligations;

(4) encourages each father to devote time, energy, and resources to his children, recognizing that children need not only material support, but also, more importantly, a secure, affectionate, family environment;

(5) urges governments and institutions at every level to remove barriers to father involvement and enact public policies that encourage and support the efforts of fathers who do want to become more engaged in the lives of their children;

(6) to demonstrate the commitment of the Senate to those critically important goals, designates June 20, 1999, as "National Father's Return Day";

(7) calls on fathers around the country to use the day to reconnect and rededicate themselves to their children's lives, to spend National Father's Return Day with their children, and to express their love and support for them; and

(8) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe "National Father's Return Day" with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1999

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday, June 21. I further ask unanimous consent that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then proceed to a period for morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator VOINOVICH, 30 minutes; Senator DURBIN, or his designee, 30 minutes; Senator ROBERTS, 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. I further ask unanimous consent that following morning business, the Senate begin consideration of S. 1233, the agricultural appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, on Monday, the Senate will convene at 12 noon and be in a period for morning business until 1 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will immediately proceed to the agriculture appropriations bill, with amendments expected to be offered. Also, amendments to the State Department authorization bill could be debated on Monday in an attempt to complete action on that legislation. Therefore, Senators can expect multiple votes on Monday at 5:30 p.m. on amendments to the agriculture appropriations bill and/or the State Department authorization bill.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that I be recognized in morning business for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized.

#### GUN CONTROL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, during the course of this week we have come to the Senate floor many times to discuss pending legislation of great importance to families across America.

Last night—I guess this morning, in the early morning hours—the House of Representatives failed to pass the gun control legislation which the Senate enacted 3 weeks ago.

You may remember that Vice President GORE came to the floor, cast the deciding vote, broke the tie, and we passed a bill which would try to close the loopholes for the sales of firearms at so-called gun shows, trying to find a way—any way we can—to reduce the likelihood that guns will get into the hands of children and criminals.

America's heart was broken by Littleton, CO. Families across America, who may have heard these numbing statistics about 13 children a day dying, finally realized it could happen there—it could happen in Littleton, CO, in Conyers, GA, in Jonesboro, AR, in Pearl, MS, West Paducah, KY, Springfield, OR, or in Springfield, IL, my hometown. It could happen anywhere.

Guns are just too easy to come by in America. Troubled kids, who are always a problem, become tragedies when they take these guns into the classrooms, killing their classmates and teachers.

So we passed legislation, good legislation, bipartisan legislation, and sent it to the House of Representatives. Frankly, they decided, because of the political heat that might be generated, to call for a vote in the middle of the night, at 1:15 in the morning, to ask the House of Representatives to go on the Record, because the leadership in the House thought Americans would not notice it if it happened in the middle of the night. The National Rifle Association did not think Americans would care. They are both wrong.

America understands what happened in the dark of night. There was a shot in the dark, and it hit American families right where they live—families who worry about whether sending their kids to school anymore is a safe thing to do, families who wonder, when they say good-bye to their child in the morning, if those are the last words they will ever share with their child.

That is where we are in America. That is where gun violence has brought us. But this is not a fatal shot on the American families. They have, I guess, the hope and the confidence that this Congress will come to its senses and once and for all say no to these gun lobbies and yes to safety in our schools.

The big debate in the House was whether or not we ought to post the